

that 28 million married working couples pay higher taxes today just because they are married? Is it right that our Tax Code charges a married working couple with two incomes more in taxes than an identical couple with identical incomes living together outside of marriage?

I think we all agree that that is wrong. This House made a bipartisan commitment, by adopting the 90-10, plan not only to save Social Security, setting aside \$1.4 trillion to save Social Security, but also to work to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

When I think of Social Security, I think of my mom and dad but. When I think of the marriage tax penalty. I think of my sister, Pat, and brother-in-law Rich, a school teacher and a farmer back home in Sheldon, Illinois who are just like 28 million other married working couples. They suffer the marriage tax penalty.

Under our legislation, by doubling the standard deduction for joint filers to twice that of a single filer, raising it from \$6900 to \$8300, we save 28 million married working couples \$243 under the 90-10 plan. That saves Social Security and helps eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Back home in the south suburbs, towns like Joliet, Illinois, \$243, that is a car payment, that is a couple months' worth of day care for a family with kids that need to be in day care while mom and dad are forced to go to work just to pay the taxes. That is a big victory.

I am also proud that not only does doubling the standard deduction for joint filers to twice that of a single filer save \$243 but it also simplifies the Tax Code, one of the other goals of our Republican Congress. By simplifying our Tax Code, in fact, our marriage tax relief not only saves \$243 each for 28 million couples, but we allow 6 million married working couples to no longer have to file a schedule A. They will only need to file a schedule 1040 EZ, meaning they will no longer need to itemize. We are simplifying their tax filing process.

Mr. Speaker, that is a big victory. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle keep raising this ogre. They always say somehow by working to eliminate the marriage tax penalty that somehow because you are doing that you are somehow hurting the Social Security trust fund.

As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, two weeks ago we asked a representative of the Social Security Administration, the deputy commissioner, and her name, Judy Chesser, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) asked Judith Chesser, he asked her, now, as a result of the tax bill, the tax cuts contained in the 90-10 plan, that the committee was planning to vote out, will there be any impact on the Social Security trust fund. Judith Chesser said, absolutely, no.

The 90-10 plan is good for families back home. It helps farmers in Illinois.

It helps small business people in Illinois. Helps those who want to send their kids off to college. We eliminate the marriage tax penalty for a majority of those who suffer it. The bottom line is, we also save Social Security by setting aside \$1.4 trillion.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m.

□ 1633

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EWING) at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3874, CHILD NUTRITION AND WIC REAUTHORIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1998

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3874) to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to provide children with increased access to food and nutrition assistance, to simplify program operations and improve program management, to extend certain authorities contained in those Acts through fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GOODLING, RIGGS, CASTLE, CLAY and MARTINEZ.

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of sections 2, 101, 104(b), 106, 202(c) and 202(o) of the House bill, and sections 101, 111, 114, 203(c), 203(r), and titles III and IV of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SMITH of Oregon, GOODLATTE, and STENHOLM.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2073, JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND DELINQUENCY ACT OF 1998

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with rule XX and by direction of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, with the concurrence of the

Committee on the Judiciary, I move to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2073) to authorize appropriations for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my motion. The bill addresses the problem of juvenile crime in this country. We all know that juvenile crime is not going to go away on its own.

For two Congresses we have attempted to address the problem of juvenile crime through legislation supporting accountability and prevention programs. Yet we have not produced a final bill. While the states have their own initiatives to combat juvenile crime, they rely on the resources we have provided them through laws such as the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, which expired in 1996. Today's action is merely an effort to get to conference with the Senate. H.R. 3 passed the House by a vote of 286 to 123. H.R. 1818 passed the House by a vote of 413 to 14.

We need to address juvenile crime through a two-pronged approach. First, we must send a message to our youth that we will not tolerate their involvement in criminal activity. We can do this through the imposition of appropriate punishment for each crime they commit.

Second, we need to work with the youth at risk of committing juvenile acts and those who have already been in touch with the juvenile justice system to prevent their involvement in criminal activities.

I realize that some of the body have problems with certain of the provisions of the bill, that it is not perfect legislation. However this motion to go to conference is the way to address these concerns. I believe the conferees will have a much better chance to produce an approach to address the problems of juvenile crime with which we can all agree. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS).

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I will be brief, since I know we promised the minority we would not have any extended debate on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise to say that I am particularly pleased in the waning days of this Congress, the 105th Congress, in our country's history, we are going to be able to go to conference with the Senate on hopefully a comprehensive approach to combating juvenile crime.

As the chairman mentioned, there are two measures that have passed the House, both with strong bipartisan support; H.R. 3, the Committee on the Judiciary bill, and H.R. 1818, the bill that

originated in and was reported out of our Committee on Education and the Workforce. The two bills combined represent very tough anti-crime legislation and legislation that is focused on delinquency prevention.

I think all of us can agree, as I said on the floor when we debated this matter, that the best way to address the problem of increasing or rising juvenile crime in this country is to identify those young people who are at risk of engaging in delinquent behavior, who are at risk of committing crimes, and through appropriate intervention by interceding in their lives early on to provide them and their families, their parents and their guardians, with help and with the resources to divert them out of the juvenile justice system. That is what the comprehensive or combined approach of the two bills attempts to do.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope that we will be able to come back to the House with a comprehensive measure that is balanced, that is bipartisan and that is tough on punishment but smart on prevention. Obviously, I am very much in support of the motion to go to conference.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time, and look forward to being able to get into those deliberations with our colleagues in the other body.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak in support of this motion, and to remind my colleagues that not only will this bill reauthorize the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, it will also strengthen the process already in place where communities will be notified when a violent sexual predator is released.

Action on sexual predators was prompted years ago in my home state of Washington by the grisly crimes of repeat sexual offender Earl Shriver. Shriver had a 24-year history of violent sexual assaults on young people and confirmed all the studies of high rates of recidivism. He was repeatedly jailed and released—committing the same crimes for which he was first incarcerated over and over again.

After a series of other crimes committed by repeat sexual offenders like Earl Shriver, the Washington State legislature met in a 1990 special session and passed the Sexually Violent Predators Act.

The Senior Senator from Washington then brought our state model back to D.C. to implement on the federal level. I worked in the House to include the model in the 1994 Crime bill. The sad incident in New Jersey with Megan Kanka was unfortunately an additional factor, and the impetus for including sexually violent predator language in the 1994 Crime bill. With the Senior Senator's help, Mr. Zimmer and I were able to convince conferees on the 1994 crime bill to include community notification, registration, and tracking of sexually violent predators in the bill.

Since the 1994 crime law, and the subsequent enactment of Megan's Law, almost all states have developed tracking programs that require convicted sexual predators to register with local law enforcement agencies upon release and allow officials to notify local communities of their presence.

Empowering families, women, and children with the knowledge that a potential threat is present in their community enables them to take the necessary precautions to ensure that there are not second, third or fourth victims. Communities must know when a sexual predator has moved in next door or down the street. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is time that we take this good law one step further before we are shocked once again to hear of a needless death or crime committed by a violent sexual offender.

Included in this bill is an amendment I offered with my colleagues, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. DEAL, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This amendment requires each state to create a method by which it will notify parents when a juvenile sex offender is enrolled in their child's elementary or secondary school.

This is a simple refinement of the work we have done in the past, in order for the law to accomplish what Congress intended: ensuring the safety and well-being of our children as they attend school.

Some of our colleagues may wonder why notification under Megan's Law is not enough. Oftentimes our schools include students from a variety of nearby communities. Community notification, therefore, will not reach some of the parents of these children. Without this knowledge, parents would not be able to take the necessary precautions to protect their children from being victims of a possible re-offense. Parents deserve the peace of mind of knowing that their children will be safe from sexual predators as they attend school.

Mr. Speaker, this provision complements Megan's Law and empowers parents whose children attend schools outside their communities, as well as those whose children go to neighborhood schools.

We simply cannot let what happened to Megan Kanka happen again. Not in any community and, especially, not on a playground during recess.

I urge my colleagues to show their support for children and families and vote to send this bill to conference.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Further proceedings on this motion will be postponed until 5 p.m.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1702

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Everett) at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2073, JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT OF 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on the motion to request a conference on S. 2073 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 376, nays 36, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

YEAS—376

Abercrombie	Carson	Forbes
Ackerman	Castle	Ford
Aderholt	Chabot	Fox
Allen	Chambliss	Frank (MA)
Andrews	Chenoweth	Franks (NJ)
Archer	Christensen	Frelinghuysen
Armey	Clay	Frost
Bachus	Clayton	Galleghy
Baesler	Clement	Ganske
Baker	Coble	Gejdenson
Baldacci	Coburn	Gekas
Ballenger	Collins	Gephardt
Barcia	Combest	Gibbons
Barr	Condit	Gilchrest
Barrett (NE)	Cook	Gillmor
Barrett (WI)	Cooksey	Gilman
Bartlett	Costello	Gonzalez
Barton	Cox	Goode
Bass	Coyne	Goodlatte
Bateman	Cramer	Goodling
Becerra	Crapo	Gordon
Bentsen	Cubin	Graham
Bereuter	Cummings	Granger
Berman	Cunningham	Green
Berry	Danner	Greenwood
Bilbray	Davis (FL)	Gutierrez
Billirakis	Davis (IL)	Gutknecht
Bishop	Davis (VA)	Hall (OH)
Blagojevich	DeGette	Hall (TX)
Bliley	DeLauro	Hamilton
Blumenauer	DeLay	Hansen
Blunt	Deusch	Hastert
Boehlert	Diaz-Balart	Hastings (FL)
Boehner	Dickey	Hastings (WA)
Bonilla	Dingell	Hayworth
Bono	Dixon	Hefley
Borski	Doggett	Hefner
Boswell	Dooley	Herger
Boucher	Doolittle	Hill
Boyd	Doyle	Hilleary
Brady (PA)	Dreier	Hinojosa
Brady (TX)	Duncan	Hobson
Brown (CA)	Dunn	Hoekstra
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Holden
Brown (OH)	Ehlers	Hooley
Bryant	Ehrlich	Horn
Bunning	Emerson	Hostettler
Burr	Engel	Houghton
Burton	English	Hoyer
Buyer	Ensign	Hunter
Calvert	Eshoo	Hutchinson
Camp	Etheridge	Hyde
Campbell	Evans	Istook
Canady	Everett	Jackson (IL)
Cannon	Ewing	Jefferson
Capps	Fattah	Jenkins
Cardin	Foley	John